

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NELDA AYALA, MOHAMMED ELISSAOUI, EBER VEGA, :

NOT FOR ELECTRONIC OR PRINT PUBLICATION

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

-against-

and CARLOS GARCIA

14-CV-5269 (ARR) (JO)

YOUR FAVORITE AUTO REPAIR & DIAGNOSTIC CENTER, INC., AUTO MAINTENANCE SALES & SERVICE CAR WASHING & DETAILING, INC., and ANTHONY BOUMOUSSA, as an individual,

Defendants.

ROSS, United States District Judge:

Plaintiffs brought this action pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201-19, and New York Labor Law ("NYLL"), §§ 190-99 & 650-65. Plaintiffs sought to recover overtime and spread of hours wages allegedly due to them, as well as liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and statutory penalties for wage notice and statement violations. See Amended Complaint, ECF No. 41. I held a two-day bench trial on September 12 and 13, 2016 to determine whether plaintiffs are entitled to back wages and other damages pursuant to their claims. See ECF Nos. 78, 79. On September 16, 2016, I issued an opinion holding that plaintiffs have proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendants violated the FLSA's and NYLL's overtime provisions and failed to provide wage notices and statements as required under the NYLL. ECF No. 85. I awarded plaintiffs compensatory and liquidated damages, statutory damages, and prejudgment interest, and directed the parties to file calculations of damages. Id. at 58. In lieu of filing damages calculations, the parties reached an agreement to settle the case. On December 5, 2016, they submitted a joint request for approval of their settlement agreement. ECF

No. 91; see also Cheeks v. Freeport Pancake House, Inc., 796 F.3d 199 (2d Cir. 2015) (requiring

district court or Department of Labor approval for settlement of actions brought under the FLSA).

On December 16, 2016, the Honorable James Orenstein, United States Magistrate Judge,

issued a Report and Recommendation finding that the parties' settlement agreement is "fair and

reasonable" and recommending that the parties' motion for settlement be granted. See Docket

Entry (Dec. 16, 2016). The time for filing objections has passed and no objections have been filed.

Accordingly, the court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation for clear error on the face

of the record. See Advisory Comm. Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); accord Brissett v. Manhattan

& Bronx Surface Transit Operating Auth., No. 09-cv-874, 2011 WL 1930682, at *1 (E.D.N.Y.

May 19, 2011). Having reviewed the record, I find no clear error. I hereby adopt the Report and

Recommendation in its entirety as the opinion of the court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

SO ORDERED.

/s/(ARR)

United States District Judge

Dated: January <u>4</u>, 2017

Brooklyn, New York

2